REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is made to clarify the recitation of the semantic evaluation meta-data recited in the claims and to obviate the strained interpretation of this expression, as may have formed the basis of the rejection here under reply.

Claims 69-71, 73-77, 79, 80 and 82 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-68, 72, 78 and 81 were canceled previously. Claims 69-71, 74, 77 and 80 are independent, and are amended in this response. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. The Examiner's attention is directed to, for example, page 9, page 11 et seq., page 13, pages 36-38, pages 77-78 and page 87 of the specification. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification.

Claims 69-71, 74, 75, 77 and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Goldberg (U.S. Patent 5,963,203), Abecassis (U.S. Patent 5,724,472) and Maquire (U.S. Patent 5,995,941). The combination of Goldberg and Abecassis has been discussed in previous amendments; and the deficiencies of these references relative to Applicant's claims have been pointed out before. Rather than repeat Applicant's earlier arguments, which are still applicable, reference is made to Applicant's amendments filed December 9, 2005, March 31, 2006, October 6, 2006, December 18, 2006, January 17, 2007, May 25, 2007 and September 17, 2007. In the present Office Action, Maquire is relied upon to allegedly cure the deficiencies previously noted in the Goldberg-Abecassis combination and to

00622175.DOC

provide an alleged teaching of "a summary digest of said video" (see page 4 of the Office Action).[1]

Claims 73, 76, 79, and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Goldberg, Abecassis and Maquire, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,555 (Hjelsvold).[2]

One objective of the present invention is to generate a summary digest video of the content of the main video data by using the semantic evaluation meta-data that indicates the impact or significance on the story, or content, of the main video data of particular shots or scenes. Those shots having important significance, based on, for example, the semantic score, are extracted to produce the summary digest from which a user can determine whether or not he wants to view the entire video content. Thus, the user need not view an entire program or movie or other content, simply to conclude that he is not interested in that content.

As clarified, the semantic evaluation meta-data has a value that measures the relevance of the shot to which that meta-data is attached. The user may extract those shots whose meta-data values satisfy the user's criteria; and a sequence of those extracted shots is formed, thereby generating the summary digest video which is described in the claims as an abridged version of the content.

Claim 69 recites, *inter alia*:

"A method for transmitting video data comprising ...

obtaining semantic evaluation meta-data including evaluation values of each shot or

---

[1] It is noted here that the Office Action apparently relies on an earlier rejection based on the combination of Goldberg and Ueno (see the first full paragraph at page 4), but it is assumed that Ueno no longer is used as a reference to reject any of the claims.

[2] The Office Action refers only to the combination of Goldberg and Abecassis in the rejection of claims 73, 76, 79 and 82; but since these are dependent claims, it is assumed the Examiner intended to rely on the combination of Goldberg, Abecassis and Maquire because this combination of references was used to reject the claims from which claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 depend.

scene of the main video data, said <u>semantic evaluation meta-data having a value that
measures the relevance</u> of a shot or scene and <u>representing the impact or significance of
the shot or scene in the development</u> of the content represented by the main video data;
and

transmitting the identifying data, the semantic evaluation meta-data, and the main video
data, wherein the identifying data and the semantic evaluation meta-data are used for
<u>extracting shots or scenes from the main video, based on the relevance of the extracted
shots as represented by the value of said semantic evaluation meta-data,</u> for a user to
generate from said extracted shots a <u>summary digest video formed of a sequence of said
extracted shots, which is an abridged version, of said content</u>. (Emphasis added)

While Applicant recognizes that the entirety of the references has been used in the

rejection of the claims, Applicant also appreciates that the Examiner is of the view that the

specific portions noted in the Office Action under reply are of particular relevance to the claims.

Accordingly, the following discussion focuses on the specifically cited portions of particular

relevance.

Applicant respectfully submits that the relied upon portions of Goldberg,

Abecassis and Maquire do not teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 69.

Goldberg relates to interactive interfaces for video information providing a displayed view of a

quasi-object called a root image. The root image consists of a plurality of basic frames selected

from the video information, arranged such that their respective x and y directions are aligned

with the x and y directions in the root image and the z direction in the root image corresponds to

time, such that base frames are spaced apart in the z direction of the root image in accordance

with their time separation. The displayed view of the root image changes in accordance with a

designated viewing position, as if the root image were a three-dimensional object. The user can

manipulate the displayed image by designating different viewing positions, selecting portions of

the video information for playback and by special effects, such as cutting open the quasi-object

for a better view. A toolkit permits interface designers to design such interfaces, notably so as to

U.S. Appln. No. 09/890,054
Reply to Final Office Action dated October 27, 2008

PATENT
450101-02432

control the types of interaction which will be possible between the interface and an end user. Implementations of the interfaces may include editors and viewers. There is no suggestion in Goldberg of semantic evaluation meta-data as recited in claim 69.

Abecassis relates to a variable content video comprising a video and a segment map, the segment map defining a plurality of video segments of the video responsive to at least one pre-established content category, the segment map providing information for a video system to automatically select, retrieve, and transmit as a continuous video, video segments from the plurality of video segments responsive to a preference with respect to the at least one pre-established content category. The content category may be a category of possibly unsuitable content such as violence. The plurality of video segments may comprise parallel segments to provide greater variety in the level of explicitness. In an embodiment the variable content video is stored in a memory device such as a portable laser readable memory. Contrary to the conclusion reached in the Office Action under reply, Abecassis does not suggest the semantic evaluation meta-data recited in Applicant's claim 69. Nor does Abecassis suggest that individual shots or scenes may be extracted from a main video based on the relevance of the extracted shots as represented by the value of said semantic evaluation meta-data, from which a summary digest video, formed of a sequence of the extracted shots, is generated to thereby constitute an abridged version of the content.

Maquire is directed to a correlation tool that correlates an audience reaction to different portions of a speaker's presentation (col. 1, lines 44-45). Dial-type controls provide the audience reaction to the presentation; and signals from the audience meters are "correlated by time with the video signal and the audio signal" of the presentation (col. 3, lines 29-35). Statistical analysis of the meter signals can determine points of interest, such as low points, in the

00622175.DOC

presentation (col. 4, lines 7-12). The segments of the video having meter signals of interest can be parsed to create summary video having only segments which are of interest to the presenter (co. 5, lines 56-60). It is respectfully submitted, there is nothing in Maquire that suggests or even relates to "semantic evaluation meta-data." The meter signals are not "meta-data." Nor are the segments parsed by Maquire "an abridged version of said content." Rather, these parsed segments merely are those portions of the presentation that are favorable or unfavorable to the audience -- they clearly cannot be used to represent the development of the content, are not an abridged version of the content, and do not help a user to determine if he is sufficiently interested in viewing the entire content from which the segments are extracted.

Therefore, in view of the significant differences between Applicant's claim 69 and the cumulative teachings of Goldberg, Abecassis and Maquire, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 69 is patentable over this combination of references.

Claim 70 is the corresponding transmitter and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 71 and 74 are the corresponding receiving method and receiver, respectively, and are therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 77 and 80 are the corresponding transmitting/receiving method and transmission/reception system, respectively, and are therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. The addition of Hjelsvold provides no teaching of the semantic evaluation meta-data and the use of

00622175.DOC

that meta-data, as recited in claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 by reason of the dependencies of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and requests early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By /s/ William S. Frommer
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800